# Exhibit 24



#: 8968

Document 172-24

## **Transcript of Daniel Patrick Burke**

**Date:** January 20, 2023

Case: XR Communications, LLC -v- Amazon.com, Inc., et al.

**Planet Depos** 

**Phone:** 888-433-3767 **Fax:** 888-503-3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

WORLDWIDE COURT REPORTING & LITIGATION TECHNOLOGY

26

1 12:35:16 individuals at XR who you communicated with? 12:35:23 2 Just repeat it or somebody read that 12:35:25 3 back? Do you -- sure. Do you recall the 12:35:27 4 12:35:28 5 names of any individuals at XR Communications who 12:35:32 6 you communicated with? 7 I believe the two that I communicated 12:35:41 12:35:43 8 with initially were Kai Hansen and Adrian Zajac. 9 Okay, did you eventually communicate 12:35:52 12:35:56 10 with any other individuals at XR Communications? 12:36:05 11 Yes. 12:36:05 12 0 Do you recall those names? 12:36:06 13 Α No. 14 12:36:11 What did XR Communications hire you to 15 12:36:14 do? 12:36:15 16 They hired me to help them with an 12:36:21 17 agreement in which they were acquiring some patent 18 12:36:25 properties. 19 12:36:33 Did your work for XR Communications 12:36:35 20 involve any other tasks? 12:36:39 21 Yes. 22 And what were those? 12:36:41 23 12:36:46 I helped them with some patent 12:36:48 24 prosecution. 25 12:36:52 Q And that was prosecution of the patent

27

1 12:36:55 properties that they acquired? 2 12:36:57 Some of them I believe, yes. 3 12:37:10 When did your work for XR 12:37:12 4 Communications end, approximately? 12:37:18 5 The latter half of 2011, I believe. 12:37:33 6 Q So approximately how long did you do 7 12:37:35 work for XR Communications? 12:37:39 8 Short of two years. Less than two 9 12:37:41 years. 12:37:46 10 Why did your work for XR Communications 12:37:49 11 end? 12 12:37:51 MS. CHAN: I would caution the witness 12:37:52 13 not to reveal the substance of any attorney-client 14 12:37:54 communications, but you can generally respond. 12:38:07 15 I don't think it was ever THE WITNESS: 12:38:08 16 said, but I made clear that I was not expert in 12:38:11 17 the technology. And it wasn't long after that, 18 12:38:17 that I was transferring the finals to another 19 12:38:19 firm. 12:38:24 20 The prosecution, I think, was flowed 12:38:28 21 after we did that purchase agreement, which I had 22 no qualms in handling that. But getting into the 12:38:31 23 12:38:39 prosecution I was relying entirely on them for the 12:38:43 24 substance or the technical aspects of responses to 12:38:52 25 the patent office.

28

1	BY MR KOHLHEPP:	12:38:54
2	Q So fair to say that the subject of the	12:39:10
3	patents that you were prosecuting for XR was not	12:39:11
4	in the area of your technical expertise?	12:39:17
5	MR. BARHAM: Objection to form; you can	12:39:23
6	answer.	12:39:24
7	THE WITNESS: Generally, yes.	12:39:24
8	BY MR KOHLHEPP:	12:39:25
9	Q And for that reason you didn't feel	12:39:35
10	comfortable prosecuting patents for XR	12:39:41
11	Communications?	12:39:45
12	MR. BARHAM: Objection to form. You	12:39:48
13	can answer.	12:39:49
14	THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say that. I	12:39:52
15	would say I was relying upon technical people at	12:39:54
16	XR for everything technical.	12:39:59
17	BY MR KOHLHEPP:	12:40:18
18	Q Did you ever do work for an entity	12:40:19
19	called Aequitas?	12:40:21
20	A I don't know. I don't know who all the	12:40:25
21	players were. I mean the name's somewhat	12:40:27
22	familiar, but I don't know if I ever if they	12:40:29
23	were ever Aequitas that I was representing or the	12:40:32
24	people that I was representing were always XR. I	12:40:34
25	just don't remember.	12:40:39

55

1 01:51:09 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 2 01:51:10 Is it possible that you relied on the 3 01:51:11 statement of Mr. Schwedler that the delay during 01:51:16 4 that period was unintentional? 01:51:22 5 MS. CHAN: Objection to form. 01:51:26 6 THE WITNESS: It's possible that I 7 01:51:27 relied on communications with him and other 01:51:34 8 people. 9 So if -- I'm just trying to define the 01:51:41 01:51:42 10 parameters of your question. Are you saying -- I 01:51:43 11 don't know if you're asking is it possible that I 12 01:51:46 relied exclusively on him or is it him and others? 13 01:51:53 The bottom line is I don't remember, 01:51:54 14 but I'm sure a lot of things are possible. 01:51:58 15 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 16 01:52:00 What did you rely on as the basis for 01:52:05 17 asserting that the delay from June of 2008 through 18 01:52:08 early December 2009 was unintentional? 19 01:52:13 Sitting here today, I don't remember. 01:52:19 20 What did you do to investigate whether 01:52:23 21 the delay from June of 2008 through early 22 December 2009 was unintentional? 01:52:27 23 01:52:31 I don't remember. Α 01:52:38 24 Did you talk with Mr. Schwedler? 0 01:52:42 25 Α I don't remember speaking to Mr.

56

1 01:52:44 Schwedler. 2 01:52:54 Do you recall communicating with anyone 3 01:52:55 else about the circumstances of why no office 01:53:02 4 action response was filed in June of 2008 through 01:53:05 5 December 2009 in the '329 application? 01:53:09 6 MR. BARHAM: Object to the form. You 7 01:53:14 can answer. 01:53:14 8 THE WITNESS: Can you just give me the 9 question back again, please? I'm not asking you 01:53:16 01:53:20 10 to change it; I just want to make sure I have it 01:53:23 11 clear. 01:53:23 12 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 13 01:53:24 Do you recall communicating with anyone 01:53:27 14 else about the circumstances of why no office 01:53:30 15 action response was filed during the time period 16 01:53:33 of June 2008 through December 2009, in the matter 01:53:38 17 of the '329 application? 18 01:53:50 MS. CHAN: Objection to form. 19 01:54:12 THE WITNESS: I have a vaque 01:54:13 20 recollection of working on the -- whatever is 01:54:14 21 called the purchase agreement for the patent 22 properties. 01:54:16 23 01:54:17 There's a representation in there about 01:54:18 24 representations made to the patent office, I 25 01:54:20 believe. I believe I would have been the one to

#### Transcript of Daniel Patrick Burke January 20, 2023

1 01:54:27 put that in there because I was representing XR. 2 01:54:33 There's nobody else -- I mean the 01:54:34 3 other -- I don't recall anybody else working on 01:54:36 4 that agreement on our side, so to speak. I'm sure 01:54:40 5 I communicated with the clients and I know the 01:54:48 other side wouldn't have voluntarily put it in 6 7 01:54:51 there. I think we started with something that 01:54:51 8 9 really didn't get the job done, so I think there 01:54:54 01:54:56 10 was a lot of re-drafting of wherever we started. 01:55:02 11 That's -- it's a very vague recollection, and it's 01:55:06 12 very general, but that's all I really remember and 01:55:16 13 I'm not saying that's everything but I think it's 14 01:55:18 responsive to your question. And as far as who I 01:55:21 15 was communicating with, I don't remember. 16 01:55:27 I'm sure they had counsel on their 01:55:28 17 Well, I'm not sure but I quess they did. side. 18 01:55:33 really don't know. I could have been dealing with 19 01:55:35 the principals on the other side. I just don't 01:55:37 20 That would have been unusual. 01:55:43 21 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 22 So you are referring to a 01:55:43 23 01:55:44 representation about a representation made to the 01:55:46 24 patent office. What do you mean by that? 01:55:52 25 I recall there's something in the

58

1 01:55:54 purchase agreement saying that representations 2 01:55:59 made to the patent office were accurate. 01:56:09 3 Something to that effect. I'm sure you have 01:56:12 4 the -- I assume you have the document. 01:56:14 5 Okay, are you saying that's what you 01:56:15 6 relied on in making your representation to the 7 01:56:20 patent office, that the entire period of delay in 01:56:25 8 the '329 application was unintentional? 9 No, sir. 01:56:33 01:56:34 10 MR. BARHAM: Objection, that misstates 01:56:35 11 his prior testimony. 01:56:36 12 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 01:56:36 13 Okay, what did you rely on in making 01:56:38 14 that representation to the patent office? 01:56:40 15 I don't recall. Α 01:56:43 16 MR. BARHAM: Objection to the prior 01:56:44 17 question as asked and answered. 18 01:57:17 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 19 01:57:18 Do you have any recollection of doing 01:57:19 20 your own independent investigation into the 01:57:24 21 circumstances of how the '329 patent application 22 became abandoned? 01:57:29 23 01:57:41 I really don't understand the question. 01:57:43 24 What do you mean by my own independent 25 01:57:46 investigation? It wasn't like I was digging for

#### Transcript of Daniel Patrick Burke January 20, 2023

1		
1	something to try to find a, you know, a weapon or	01:57:50
2	something, right? It's like anything I did for	01:57:54
3	that prior time period would be relying upon what	01:57:59
4	other people told me, right. Just because I	01:58:03
5	wasn't there, it wasn't like this was an	01:58:09
6	application that my office or that we had dropped	01:58:12
7	the ball on that we'd have to re-launch.	01:58:14
8	I'm just saying that clearly we had to	01:58:19
9	rely on somebody or somebodies so	01:58:20
10	Q My question is: What did you rely on?	01:58:26
11	Was it something somebody told you?	01:58:28
12	A I don't remember.	01:58:31
13	MS. CHAN: Asked and answered.	01:58:35
14	BY MR KOHLHEPP:	01:58:44
15	Q At the time that you made the statement	01:58:45
16	to the patent office on the second page of Burke	01:58:48
17	Exhibit 4, that the entire delay from June of 2008	01:58:54
18	through November 8th, 2010 was unintentional, did	01:59:01
19	you know why the '329 application had gone	01:59:05
20	abandoned?	01:59:08
21	A I don't remember anything about that, I	01:59:11
22	really don't.	01:59:14
23	Q Sitting here today, do you know why the	01:59:16
24	'329 application had gone abandoned?	01:59:19
25	A We saw something that says somebody	01:59:26

96

		i
1	really no way that that would have been covered in	03:23:01
2	here or one of these, that part of it. But I	03:23:04
3	think you also referred to power of attorney.	03:23:11
4	They had a power of attorney that	03:23:14
5	probably listed that application, and that was	03:23:15
6	earlier. I don't know. I mean could that have	03:23:17
7	been included in one of these invoices? Maybe.	03:23:20
8	Q So, Mr. Burke, sitting here today can	03:23:33
9	you identify anything specific that you did to	03:23:35
10	investigate circumstances of how the '329 patent	03:23:42
11	application became abandonment?	03:23:45
12	MR. BARHAM: Objection to form. You	03:23:49
13	can answer.	03:23:50
14	THE WITNESS: Just give me that	03:23:55
15	question again, please?	03:23:56
16	BY MR KOHLHEPP:	03:23:58
17	Q Sitting here today can you identify	03:24:01
18	anything specific that you did to investigate the	03:24:02
19	circumstances of how the '329 patent application	03:24:06
20	became abandoned?	03:24:09
21	MR. BARHAM: I'm going to object to the	03:24:12
22	question. Are you asking for his recollection?	03:24:13
23	Do you ever want to hear about his practice, what	03:24:14
24	his practice would have been or is that not	03:24:19
25	interesting to you.	03:24:20

#### Transcript of Daniel Patrick Burke January 20, 2023

1 MR KOHLHEPP: Counsel, please eliminate 03:24:22 2 03:24:24 the speaking objections. The question was clear 03:24:27 3 and if Mr. Burke can answer it, he can answer it 03:24:29 4 and I'll just ask it again. 03:24:31 5 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 03:24:33 6 Mr. Burke, please answer if you can. 7 03:24:37 Sitting here today, can you identify 03:24:38 8 anything specific that you did to investigate the 03:24:41 9 circumstances of how the '329 patent application 03:24:45 10 became abandoned? 03:24:53 11 The only thing that comes out of all 03:24:55 12 this -- I mean, I don't remember what I did back 03:24:58 13 then, in one way or the other, but the only thing 03:25:01 14 that comes out of all this we talked -- you know, 03:25:02 15 we referred to already -- we didn't talk about a 03:25:05 16 lot, but I think there was a representation in the 17 03:25:10 purchase agreement. That's the only thing I can 18 03:25:15 see or -- I really, don't have any recollection of 19 03:25:19 what happened, you know. What are we talking 11 20 03:25:22 years ago or something, 12 years ago, but the only 03:25:28 21 thing I can remember that, you know, sort of 22 relates to this at all or could relate to it is 03:25:30 23 03:25:33 that representation. 03:25:36 24 What was the representation? 03:25:39 25 A You'd have to look at the agreement or

98

1		
1	show me the agreement. I could find it for you,	03:25:42
2	but it was to the effect that what previous people	03:25:45
3	had said to the patent office was true and	03:25:48
4	correct. Something like that.	03:25:50
5	Q So you rely on	03:25:56
6	A No, I'm not saying I relied on it, but	03:25:57
7	it could have that could have been something I	03:25:59
8	relied on in part. I don't know.	03:26:02
9	Q I'm asking: Did you rely on that?	03:26:06
10	A I don't remember.	03:26:08
11	Q Okay, so other than a representation in	03:26:13
12	the purchase agreement that you may or may not	03:26:21
13	have relied on, can you identify anything else,	03:26:25
14	sitting here today, that you did to investigate	03:26:30
15	the circumstances of how the '329 patent	03:26:32
16	application became abandonment?	03:26:35
17	A No, I could just tell you no, the	03:26:39
18	answer is no. I could tell you what my general	03:26:41
19	practice is, but the answer to my question is	03:26:44
20	"no."	03:26:47
21	Q And you would agree we've looked at a	03:27:09
22	fair number of documents today, correct?	03:27:10
23	A Excuse me?	03:27:12
24	Q You would agree that we've looked at a	03:27:14
25	fair number of documents today, correct?	03:27:16

99

03:27:19 1 I wouldn't characterize it that way. Α 2 03:27:21 0 We've looked at documents today, 03:27:23 3 correct? 03:27:24 4 We have. 03:27:25 5 And none of those documents refreshed 03:27:35 6 your recollection about anything specific you may 7 03:27:37 have done to investigate the circumstances of how 03:27:40 8 the '329 patent application became abandonment? 03:27:47 9 That's correct. 03:28:28 10 Let's put up tab 15 and mark that as 03:28:31 11 Burke Exhibit number 11. 03:28:32 12 (Whereupon, Burke Deposition Exhibit 11 03:28:32 13 was marked for identification and attached 14 03:28:32 to the transcript.) 15 03:29:10 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 16 03:29:11 Mr. Burke I'll represent that this was 17 03:29:14 one of the documents that your counsel produced to 18 03:29:16 us. And my question is: Do you recognize this 19 03:29:22 document? 20 03:31:29 THE WITNESS: No, the only thing that 03:31:31 21 seems vaguely familiar is the name of the county 22 and I don't know why. 03:31:33 23 BY MR KOHLHEPP: 03:31:34 03:31:36 24 But otherwise you do not recognize 03:31:39 25 Burke Exhibit 11?

04:18:20 1 I wouldn't say "many" but clearly some. Α 04:18:25 2 And in the times that you have trained 04:18:29 3 other attorneys do you tell them that it's 04:18:35 4 important to try to stay knowledgeable about the 04:18:37 5 rules of practice and procedure governing the 04:18:40 6 prosecution of patents with the patent office? 7 04:18:45 I don't remember ever saying that. 04:18:51 8 But, generally speaking, would you say 04:18:54 9 that's a best practice that you would advise? 10 04:19:00 Sure, in any field, yes. You want to 04:19:02 11 keep up on what's going on. 04:19:05 12 I'm going to turn back to one of the 13 04:19:06 exhibits that we reviewed earlier. 14 04:19:12 If someone could please pull up on the 15 04:19:14 screen Exhibit 9 and make sure to give Mr. Burke 04:19:17 16 control of the exhibit. I do not have control of 17 04:19:27 the exhibit, so I have to ask if somebody can 18 please share the screen. 04:19:29 19 04:19:31 Thank you. Okay, Mr. Burke, do you 20 04:19:37 recall looking at this exhibit earlier? 21 04:19:53 I remember looking at it earlier today. 22 And is this the letter from the patent 04:19:55 23 04:19:57 office granting your petition to revive '329 04:20:01 24 application? 25 04:20:03 As best I can tell, it's part of it.

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

1 04:20:08 I'm going to direct your attention to a 04:20:10 2 more specific part of it. 04:20:13 3 If you can scroll down to that final 04:20:15 4 paragraph shown there. And read -- I'll direct 04:20:23 5 you to the second sentence that begins with: 04:20:26 6 "Nevertheless such statement is being 7 04:20:28 treated as having been made, as a result of a 04:20:31 8 reasonable inquiry into the facts and 9 circumstances of such delay." [As read.] 04:20:34 04:20:40 10 Do you understand that the reference to 04:20:42 11 "such statement" is the Statement of Unintentional 04:20:44 12 Delay that is made in the petition to revive a 04:20:49 13 patent application? 14 04:20:51 Α Yes. 04:20:53 15 And is it your understanding that the 04:20:58 16 patent office, therefore treats a Statement of 17 04:21:01 Unintentional Delay in a petition to revive, as 04:21:06 18 made pursuant to a reasonable inquiry into facts 19 04:21:09 and circumstances of delay? 04:21:12 20 Yes. 21 04:21:18 So, in your practice do you generally 22 try to conduct a reasonable inquiry into the facts 04:21:20 04:21:23 23 and circumstances of any delay that leads to the 04:21:32 24 abandonment of a patent application? 25 04:21:36 A Other than this application, any time

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

#### Transcript of Daniel Patrick Burke January 20, 2023

1 this -- an application has gone abandoned, I just 04:21:39 04:21:43 2 knew immediately or upon conferring with somebody 04:21:47 3 with in my office, we knew immediately what 04:21:49 4 happened. 5 04:21:50 So if you want to call that a 04:21:52 6 reasonable inquiry, yes. But like I said, on 7 04:22:00 other applications that have gone abandoned that 04:22:03 8 I've been involved in reviving, to the best of my 9 recollection we dropped the ball, so we knew 04:22:06 04:22:09 10 exactly what happened, and we knew whether it 04:22:14 11 was -- we knew in the instances where we revived 04:22:17 12 them, we knew it was unintentional. 13 04:22:21 Sometimes things go abandoned and you 04:22:24 14 don't revive them because you know it was not 04:22:26 15 unintentional. 04:22:33 16 Do you generally -- oh, go ahead. 04:22:34 17 don't want to go interrupt you. 04:22:37 18 No, you're good. I think that was 04:22:38 19 addressed to, you know, whether that's a 04:22:41 20 reasonable inquiry or not. 21 04:22:43 I don't even know if it would amount to 22 04:22:47 an inquiry. 23 04:22:48 You just knew on a quick look that 04:22:50 24 something was docketed wrong, etcetera. 04:22:54 25 Thank you, Mr. Burke, I have no further

1 04:22:56 questions. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, anything else 04:23:07 2 3 04:23:07 for the record? 04:23:09 4 MS. CHAN: Is there any other defense 04:23:10 5 counsel that has questions? No. I just have a 04:23:15 6 couple, but it would be helpful if we could just 7 04:23:21 take a ten-minute break, so I could collect my 04:23:25 8 thoughts. Can we go off the record? 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record 04:23:27 10 at 16:23. 04:23:29 04:23:30 11 (Recess taken 4:23 p.m. to 4:32 p.m.) 04:32:38 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Please stand by. 13 04:32:43 Back on record, 16:32. 14 04:32:45 FURTHER EXAMINATION 04:32:49 15 BY MS. CHAN: 04:32:50 16 Thank you for your time today, 04:32:51 17 Mr. Burke. 18 I just have a couple of clarifying 04:32:52 04:32:54 19 questions for the record and hopefully we can wrap 04:32:56 20 up within a few minutes. 21 04:33:01 Mr. Burke, just to start with an easy 22 04:33:03 question: We are now in the year 2023, correct? 23 04:33:06 Α Yes. 24 04:33:07 Your representation of XR 25 04:33:09 Communications occurred roughly 13 years ago?

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

1 04:33:15 Yeah, roughly. Α 04:33:17 2 And fair to say you do not have 3 04:33:20 specific recollections of particular conversations 04:33:23 4 or actions that you performed from that time 5 04:33:26 period 13 years ago, correct? 04:33:28 6 That's correct. 7 04:33:31 And I know you've said this quite a few 04:33:32 8 times today already, but just so the record is 9 clear, many times in today's deposition you would 04:33:36 04:33:39 10 respond to counsel's questions with "I don't 04:33:42 11 recall" or "I don't remember." Do you recall 12 04:33:46 doing that? 13 04:33:46 Α I do. 14 04:33:47 So just to be clear for the record, 04:33:49 15 when you gave that response, you were not 04:33:51 16 testifying that something affirmatively did or did 17 04:33:54 not occur; is that fair? 18 That's correct. 04:33:57 19 04:33:59 Rather, you gave those responses to 04:34:01 20 indicate that sitting here today, you do not have 04:34:04 21 a specific recollection of whether or not those 22 04:34:07 actions occurred, true? 23 04:34:15 MR KOHLHEPP: Object to form. 04:34:17 24 THE WITNESS: As I understand the 25 04:34:18 question, that's true. It's correct.

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

1 04:34:24 BY MS. CHAN: 2 04:34:24 For example, you do not have a specific 3 04:34:26 recollection of whether or not you spoke with 04:34:29 4 certain individuals back in 2009 or 2010, true? 04:34:37 5 MR KOHLHEPP: Objection to form. 04:34:37 6 Mischaracterizes the testimony. 7 BY MS. CHAN: 04:34:44 04:34:45 8 I missed your response, Mr. Burke. 9 That's correct. 04:34:47 04:34:56 10 So it's fair to say that it is possible 04:34:57 11 you may have spoken with the numerous individuals 12 04:34:59 and entities we went through today. You just do 04:35:03 13 not recall one way or another, sitting here today? 14 04:35:08 MR KOHLHEPP: Object to form. 04:35:09 15 Mischaracterizes testimony. 04:35:14 16 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 04:35:26 17 BY MS. CHAN: 18 And earlier today in response to some 04:35:27 04:35:28 19 questions about your investigation into the 04:35:28 20 abandonment of the '329 patent application, you 04:35:32 21 mentioned that you had a general practice. Do you 22 04:35:34 recall talking about that? 23 04:35:41 MR. BARHAM: Object to form. 04:35:41 24 Mischaracterizes testimony. 25 04:35:45 THE WITNESS: I had a general practice

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

#### Transcript of Daniel Patrick Burke January 20, 2023

1 about dealing with all issues, all legal issues. 04:35:46 04:35:48 2 BY MS. CHAN: 04:35:49 3 Would you agree that your general 04:35:50 4 practice is to follow the PTAB rules and 04:35:53 5 procedures? 04:35:54 6 No, I wouldn't say -- I wouldn't say 7 04:35:56 I would say the PTO. the PTAB. 04:36:01 8 I apologize. Thank you for that 9 04:36:04 correction. 04:36:04 10 You know, as well as any -- as well as, 04:36:06 11 you know, the research could extend beyond the 04:36:11 12 MPEP and into decisions. 13 04:36:15 So, if the P -- I'm sorry, I 14 04:36:18 interrupted. Go on. 04:36:19 15 Well, if we did research on an issue, 16 04:36:22 it could extend beyond the, you know, the 17 04:36:25 patent -- well, we're just talking about the 18 patent side of the PTO, so beyond the MPEP into 04:36:29 19 04:36:38 court decisions. 04:36:40 20 If we research an issue, we research an 04:36:44 21 It was our practise to research, see what 22 we had to do and to do it. 04:36:44 23 04:36:47 You would agree that if the PTO 04:36:49 24 required you to conduct an investigation or 25 04:36:51 instructed you to conduct an investigation, your

### Transcript of Daniel Patrick Burke

January 20, 2023 1	30
general practice is to follow what the PTO	04:36:53
required or instructed you to do?	04:36:57
A Yes.	04:36:59
Q Counsel for Apple also asked you a	04:37:05
series of questions, asking you to specifically	04:37:07
point her to documents reflecting your	04:37:10
investigation into the abandonment of the '329	04:37:11
application; do you recall those questions?	04:37:16
A Generally.	04:37:19
Q In preparation for your testimony here	04:37:20
today is it accurate to say that you did not	04:37:22
research and review every single document in your	04:37:25
possession to figure out what investigation you	04:37:27
actually performed back in 2009 and 2010?	04:37:30
A That would be fair to say, yes.	04:37:34
Q Would it also be fair to say that you	04:37:37
do not necessarily have every single document that	04:37:39

MS. HARTJES: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: At a point in time when I stopped representing them, I turned all the physical files over to the next attorneys, so,

yes, it's definitely possible.

would have reflected your investigation that you

performed back in 2009 and 2010, as we are here

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

04:37:42

04:37:46

04:37:50

04:37:54

04:37:56

04:37:57

04:37:59

04:38:07

Document 172-24

PageID #: 8989

133

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, LISA M. BARRETT, RPR, CRR, CRC, CSR
3	do hereby certify that the witness was first duly
4	sworn by me and that I was authorized to and did
5	report said proceedings.
6	I further certify that the foregoing
7	transcript is a true and correct record of the
8	proceedings; that said proceedings were taken by
9	me stenographically and thereafter reduced to
10	typewriting under my supervision; that reading and
11	signing was requested; and that I am neither
12	attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or
13	employed by, any of the parties to the action in
14	which this deposition was taken; and that I have
15	no interest, financial or otherwise, in this case.
16	
17	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
18	my hand this 25th day of January, 2022.
19	A
20	- Gerlet
21	Lisa M. Barrett, RPR, CRR, CRC, CSR
22	Certified Realtime Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	